DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 333 380 CS 212 669

AUTHOR Simic, Marge; Smith, Carl, Comp.
TITLE The Changing Perspective in Reading Assessment. Learning Package No. 14.
INSTITUTION Indiana Univ., Bloomington. School of Education.
PUB DATE 90
NOTE 44p.; For other learning packages in this series, see CS 212 656-705. Some materials in the packey may not be completely legible when reproduced; copies provided are the best available.
AVAILABLE FROM Learning Packages, ERIC/RCS, Indiana University, Smith Research Center, Suite 150, 2805 E. 10th St., Bloomington, IN 47408-2698 ($14.00).
PUB TYPE Guides - Classroom Use - Teaching Guides (For Teacher) (052) -- Collected Works - General (020)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Distance Education; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; Informal Reading Inventories; Inservice Teacher Education; Reading Comprehension; *Reading Diagnosis; Reading Processes; Reading Skills; *Reading Tests; Student Evaluation; Teacher Role; Test Theory; *Test Validity; Theory Practice Relationship
IDENTIFIERS Educational Issues

ABSTRACT

Originally developed for the Department of Defense Schools (DoDDS) system, this learning package on changing perspective in reading assessment is designed for teachers who wish to upgrade or expand their teaching skills on their own. The package includes a comprehensive search of the ERIC database; a lecture giving an overview on the topic; the full text of several papers on the topic; copies of any existing ERIC/RCS publications on the topic; a set of guidelines for completing a goal statement, a reaction paper, and an application project; and an evaluation form. (KEH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED333380

ERIC/RCS
150 Smith Research Center
Indiana University
Bloomington, IN 47405

Learning Package #14

The Changing Perspective in Reading Assessment

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CS212469

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Dr. Carl Smith
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

OVERVIEW

ERIC/RCS Learning Packages contain just what the practitioner needs for staff development workshops. Workshops can begin with an overview lecture , continue through readings and discussion material, and end with research projects and an annotated bibliography for further research.

Each learning package contains (1) a topic overview: a four-to-six page stage-setter; (2) in most cases, a digest of research: an ERIC summary of research on the topic written by a specialist; (3) a goal statement and a survey form; and (4) an extensive annotated bibliography of ERIC references.

Graduate-level university credit is available. For further information contact Indiana University School of Continuing Studies, Owen Hall #204, Bloomington, Indiana 47405. Enrollment in each course will be limited.

THE CHANGING PERSPECTIVE IN

Reading Assessment

(All references are fully documented in enclosed bibliography, or on reference list attached to this lecture)

by Marge Simic

Lecture

Testing and assessment should be an integral part of classroom instruction. Reading tests given to children can have many different purposes. Typically, however, tests are used to see whether scores have "gone up or down in comparison to . . ." Little consideration is given to the process the tests are trying to assess, or to what influence the tests could have on effective reading instruction. In brief, the articles in this package, especially those by Farr, Valencia, and Pearson, are stating that reading tests today "do very little to assess the reading process" as it is understood presently. As we gain a better understanding of the reading process, our understanding of what tests should be measuring also increases. With this increased understanding, we must think about how to develop more appropriate tests. This, in turn, will influence curricular decisions and reading instruction.

Because informal measures can be adapted for particular situations and problem children, teachers are likely to obtain more accurate information from them than from a norm- or criterion-referenced test. Informal tests may focus on concepts of print, word recognition, vocabulary, informal reading inventories,

comprehension, and observation. It is not difficult to assess the traditionally defined "reading skills." However, reading assessment should focus on the orchestration of many kinds of knowledge and skills rather than on the knowledge and skills in isolation.

The emphases of this lecture are: 1) informal comprehension testing; 2) informal reading inventories; 3) informal word recognition tests; 4) observing children; and 5) integrating the testing program with instruction. For additional information about specific informal techniques, you may also want to consult the package on that topic.

Informal Comprehension Testing

Comprehension is at the heart of reading. Obviously, it must be evaluated. Most teachers do evaluate comprehension frequently, using informal approaches. They ask questions after children read text selections, they ask children to locate information, and they listen, as a child reads aloud, for his or her ability to express ideas with feeling and appropriate meaning. When teachers use these and other informal comprehension tests, they need to consider <u>what</u> questions to ask, <u>when</u> to ask questions, and <u>how</u> to measure children's answers.

What questions might be asked? Teacher questions should go beyond text facts and details. Make students aware of words that signal a connection between two ideas or events (e.g., "and," "or," "then," "until"). After the students have read the passage,

have them find the cue words that connect phrases and sentences. Ask them why they think those words were there, what they thought when they saw them, and how the words helped them to understand the text.

Teachers can help students become aware of the author's plans, intentions, and purposes. Guide your children in thinking about why the author wrote the text. For example, was there a moral to the story or information to be remembered? Teachers may lead a discussion after the text is read about why the author wrote it, what the author seemed to want the reader to learn or appreciate, and how the children gained new insights from the author.

Teachers also should allow for critical evaluation of the selection. Ask students if there was something in the text they did not understand, or with which they disagreed.

When should comprehension be measured? Teachers can ask questions before they teach or before they have the children read, while the lesson is proceeding, and after the lesson. Ask questions before teaching to learn about children's prior knowledge of the topic. If children are more familiar with the topic of a passage, they will be better able to answer inferential questions and will know more of the answers without looking at the text. If the teacher asks questions about the topic before teaching, he or she will know whether post-teaching assessments

are measuring information gained from reading, or simply remeasuring children's previously existing knowledge of a topic.

Ask questions while teaching if children need help with deciding what to focus on, or how to interpret different kinds of information. Have them read short segments of text, then ask questions about what they have read so far, what it means, or how to summarize it. In this way, teachers can determine whether their students are ready to read longer sections and, if not, what kind of interpretation problems they are having.

Ask questions after the text has been read or the lesson has been completed to see if children have an adequate mental model of the text. Teachers need to evaluate whether or not their students can summarize and interpret important ideas. Ask questions that have the students relate the text information to their own experiences, to other lessons on the topic, and to other authors or texts.

How might comprehension be assessed? A problem with comprehension evaluation is that it frequently does not require children to interpret or explain. Even teachers' informal questions are more often directed at facts and details than at an understanding of the larger concepts. Petrosky (1982) recommends the following ways to evaluate comprehension:

1. Test children with exercises that encourage the use of critical thinking.

2. Give assignments that ask children to write about their reading.
3. Create tests that ask them to make text interpretations and then give evidence from the texts or from their knowledge to support their answers.
4. Have children give text interpretations during science and social studies as well as language arts and reading periods. This extends their opportunity to practice forming interpretations and justifying their evaluations.
5. After children have read a text that puts forward an argument and provides evidence for it, set up discussions or debates to give children practice in evaluating arguments, in critical reasoning, and in explaining and justifying an argument.

Informal Reading Inventories (IRI)

Informal reading inventories are a popular means of measuring children's reading ability. They can provide information about children's word reading, their reading fluency, how they try to correct their errors, and what they comprehend. Informal reading inventories give the teacher a holistic or integrated account of reading problems, and thereby help teachers assess real reading progress. Teachers can use informal reading inventory results when deciding on the appropriate reading level

placement of children, and also when selecting appropriate independent reading materials for students.

Critics of informal reading inventories recommend that their results should be used only as an indication of how the child approaches reading, and not as a measure of reading performance. If informal reading inventories are to be used to measure performance, Fuchs, Fuchs, and Deno (1982) recommend giving the child many texts to read. They found that teachers may need as many as ten informal reading inventories in order to obtain a stable result.

Despite the criticisms, IRIs do have many noteworthy strengths. They involve reading in context, they provide a way to evaluate word recognition and comprehension, and they let the teacher view how a child reads both more and less difficult texts. They work well when teachers are not sure about what text materials to use with a child, or when they are puzzled about a child's reading performance and suspect that a change in instruction is needed.

Informal Word Recognition Tests

Word recognition tests have been the most common means used to evaluate beginning reading achievement. On standardized tests, word recognition is typically measured by asking children to circle the words that are read aloud. However, teachers might obtain more useful information if students were asked to recognize

words in context. While teaching a small group lesson or during an individual conference, have children read aloud sentences and paragraphs from stories. If possible, make a photocopy of the material to be read so that you can note word-reading errors directly and accurately. Analysis of the miscues will help you in determining the extent to which a child is paying attention to letter cues (graphic information), the arrangement or expected order of words in a sentence (syntactic cues), and the expected meaning (semantic cues). When a child substitutes one word for another or adds or omits words, notice whether the word is the same part of speech, and whether the changed wording fits the meaning up to that point in the sentence. In this way you will become aware of which cue sources the child is using.

Observing Children

Observing individual and group responses to activities and materials may be one of the best ways to assess children's reading. It is a way to find out why children are learning or failing to learn. Usually, you will want to observe how your students approach reading and writing, the kinds of errors they make, and their reading and writing interests.

Observing writing. Children's early writing attempts offer an excellent way to observe their progress. Teachers can measure student abilities to sequence letters in words, to use capital letters and periods, to use the correct form of letters, and to construct

sentences. Older children's writing gives insight into their letter-sound knowledge, their knowledge of grammar, their sense of the structure of stories and reports, and their ability to use different styles of written language. Their errors let teachers know how they visualize words and sentences. If they are asked to write out all they remember about a story they read, what they leave out tells the teacher what they found unimportant or did not understand or remember. The topics they write about give insights into their interests and experiences.

Observing reading. Once children begin to read stories, teachers can observe their attempt to read. According to Clay (1972), teachers can observe the child: 1) paying attention to the print rather than to the pictures; 2) remembering rules about the direction for reading words and sentences; 3) changing his or her voice when reading aloud; and 4) hearing the sound sequences of words and phrases. Reading errors will indicate what information (letters, sentence structure, text meaning, or picture) the child is using. Unusual pauses or searching and checking for words are signs that the child is making progress with a problem-solving approach to word identification and comprehension.

Older children's reading can be observed by noting their capacity for independent reading, their decisions to read or not to read during "free time," and their choice of reading material when they do read. Keep track of which children read on their own, set

up their own purposes for reading, use odd bits of time to read, show interest in books the teacher has read aloud, develop a sustained interest in topics and authors, and borrow books to read at home.

Recording observations/information. There are many ways to record observations of children's reading and writing behaviors. Teachers might make notes in a lesson diary of group or of individual children's responses to teaching procedures, topics or materials. At the end of the day, teachers might write a brief description of their attempts to teach difficult children and the children's reactions to the attempts. Teachers can focus on a different set of three to four children each week, observing them more intently during that period and writing out observations of the students' attitudes toward reading, work habits, interactions with classmates, and effective use of time. When every child has been observed once, repeat the cycle, so that over the school year there are two to three close observations for each child. Finally, teachers may want to set aside occasional five-minute periods to observe all the children as they work independently or in small groups. Watch how well they concentrate, whether they give help or work with others, and whether they maintain a cheerful and interested attitude toward reading and learning.

Student files can be developed early on in the instructional process. In them, collect journals of observations, skill proficiency

checklists, interest inventories, and compositions by each student. Include compositions written at the beginning of each school year, at mid-year (end of semester), and at the end of the year. This will make it possible to assess each student's writing proficiency/achievement based on his or her own progress rather than just in comparison to all other students. The file can be referred to when conferencing with the student and/or with parents about writing progress.

Student files are not to be confused with "permanent records." The student files can travel with the student as he or she moves from one grade to the next. This can be a valuable resource for the next teacher. Additionally, at the end of a student's elementary education, the file will be both a source of fascination and a record of accomplishment. The file then becomes the student's, but student, parents, and teachers all are able to see how far the student has come!

Integrating the Testing Program With Instruction

Assessing students' needs before teaching. With respect to overall goals, effective teachers want to have some idea of what their students already know and can do. Teachers can identify these goals from the strands (sets of related skills) listed in the curriculum. The purpose of assessment is to find out which goals or objectives individual students already seem to have met, and which they appear ready to learn next. Knowing what children are

expected to learn is the halfway mark. Additionally, their knowledge needs to be measured.

The teacher's skill as an observer, rather than as an interpreter of test scores, is most valuable in establishing a system of useful, ongoing assessment within the classroom. Listen carefully to students' responses during the teaching of a reading lesson to determine their level of understanding. For further information about their capabilities, carefully examine their first completed assignments. At times teachers may want to interact with students while they are completing seatwork assignments, to get an idea of which problem-solving strategies they are using, and which they need to learn. Every contact with the students, in person or through their work, can provide teachers with information about student needs. An effective classroom reading program cannot be developed on the basis of sheer guesswork. Assessing students' needs before teaching allows the teacher to gather information about the students in order to make informed, rather than haphazard, instructional decisions.

Setting immediate goals for instruction. On the basis of assessment -- whether formal, informal, or both -- teachers determine where their students are relative to the curriculum that will be emphasized. Once student needs are assessed, the teacher has some idea of the immediate goals that can be reached by the student. It is essential to be as accurate as

possible. Goals for student learning must be realistic in order that the teacher's and the student's time can be used to the best advantage.

Seek to meet these goals through a combination of activities. Instruction may be through teacher-led activities, through assignments pursued by small groups of students working with indirect teacher supervision, or through independent seatwork assignments.

Providing instruction to meet goals. Teacher-directed lessons must be at the students' instructional level. This is the level of difficulty at which students are challenged but also are able, with the teacher's assistance, to acquire new skills and knowledge. Because students within a class of twenty or more will generally have very different needs in learning to read, some type of grouping may be necessary for particular reading topics.

Providing opportunities for student practice and discovery. Students should be encouraged to apply the concepts they have learned in slightly different contexts. Opportunities for discovery are provided by assignments which require students to use the concept and their own background knowledge to gain new understandings independently. These lessons and assignments are said to be at each student's "independent" rather than "instructional" level. More often than not, these assignments should be completed with little or no assistance from the teacher.

Checking on student progress. Teachers should check often to see if their students are progressing in a satisfactory way toward meeting both the narrowly-defined goals and the broader goals of learning to read. Observe them working on assignments or participating in group lessons, look at writing samples, and, if they are available, administer criterion-referenced tests. This process will help in determining whether or not students are ready to move ahead to face new goals. In practice, teacher observations and judgement generally are the deciding factors here. However, test results can provide confirmation of judgments about what children have learned. If the teacher's check shows that students have met the immediate learning goal, new goals can be set. The students are now ready to enter a new teaching-learning cycle, focused on another goal or set of goals.

What is "taught" is not the same as what students "learn." If assessment indicates that the goal has not yet been met, further instruction must be provided. This means going back through certain steps within the same teaching-learning cycle. Several different methods and/or approaches are available for teaching particular types of reading skills; a variety of means can be employed to reach the same end. Simple repetition also may be used selectively.

There is a great need for researchers to reflect upon and to communicate about the importance of their findings regarding assessment practices. Teacher education on assessment is the best way to address assessment problems. Teachers must be made aware that they can and must play a role in influencing change in existing assessment models. What teachers do informally in the classroom is just as important in the evaluation of student readers as formal testing. The problem of assessment involves not only the measurement research community, but virtually all those involved in reading research and reading instruction. Failure to challenge and to modify the status quo may be the worst form of intellectual complacency.

References

Baumann, J. F., and Stevenson, J. A. (1982). Understanding standardized reading achievement test scores. *Reading Teacher*, 35 (6), 648-654.

Bauman, J. F., and Stevenson, J. A. (1982). Using scores from standardized reading achievement tests. *Reading Teacher*, 35 (5), 528-532.

Clay, M. (1979). *Reading: The Patterning of Complex Behavior*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Fuchs, L., Fuchs, D., and Deno, S. (1982). Reliability and validity of curriculum-based informal reading inventories. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 18, 6-26.

Jongsma, K. S., and Jongsma, E. A. (1981). Test review: Commercial informal reading inventories. *Reading Teacher*, 34, 697-705.

McKenna, M. (1983). Informal reading inventories: A review of the issues. *Reading Teacher*, 36, 670-679.

Petrosky, A. (1982). Reading achievement. In A. Berger and H. A. Robinson (Eds.), *Secondary School Reading: What Research Reveals for Classroom Practice*. Urbana, IL: ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication Skills and the National Conference on Research in English.

Schell, L. and Hanna, G. (1981). Can informal reading inventories reveal strengths and weaknesses in comprehension subskills?. *Reading Teacher*, 35, 263-268.

Smith, F. (1986). *Understanding Reading*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

ERIC® CLEARINGHOUSE ON READING AND COMMUNICATION SKILLS

June 1989 DIGEST

How Well Do Tests Measure Real Reading?

by Janet L. Powell

Despite a significant increase in test usage across the country, numerous issues surrounding the testing of reading remain unresolved. (See Johnston, 1986.) How validly it reflects what people actually do when they read is the most important consideration of any reading test. Construct validity – whether the test actually measures aspects of the behavior under consideration – is of particular importance if one is to rely on test scores to direct instruction, predict performance, or determine accountability. In 1917, Thorndike (see 1971 reprint), who defined reading as reasoning, helped promote the examination of reading as a cognitive process as thought guided by printed symbols (Farr and Roser, 1979).

Are we measuring process?

This slowly but continually emerging trend to recognize reading as a thinking process has been at the core of the controversies over the validity of various forms of reading assessment. Many critics of reading tests claim that most current approaches to the assessment of reading comprehension remain – as they have always been – measures of reading comprehension as a product of a reader's interaction with a text. Unable to assess the processes involved in comprehension, the tests measure comprehension as required responses that are the products of reading (Johnston, 1983).

Virtually all methods of assessing reading are indirect, even those that *claim* to directly assess reading *processes*. We cannot actually see the processes involved; we can only infer how a reader has comprehended. Therefore, all scores or data produced by tests of reading are indirect measures of the reading process.

The product of reading should, however, reflect the process the test-taker uses to generate the responses that produce a reading comprehension test score. That is to say that one ought to be able to assume that differences in test scores across test-takers and testing instances will reflect differences in the processes used to read the test passage and to respond as directed. How *directly* the two relate has never been determined; nor do we know how effectively test results can inform and direct the teaching of reading behaviors – even when those behaviors appear to be very similar to those that produce the test product. How well tests that do not emphasize or examine product might direct instruction that purports to develop process is a matter even less well understood.

Farr (1986) states that "the manuals of most standardized tests make very explicit the fact that the test will not provide information about a pupil's reading *processes*, but only information about the *product* of reading." However, he continues by saying that "...one could argue that the product – or score – isn't valid if a pupil doesn't use the actual processes of reading in determining the answers." The validity question that surrounds the tests thus seems to be whether or not taking the test *appears* to change the processes involved in comprehension and to solicit significantly atypical reading processes.

Metacognition focuses on process

A reader's awareness of thought processes involved in reading has recently come to be known as *metacognition*, and test designers are now including items that supposedly measure this (Aronson and Farr, 1988). The general knowledge of the reader guides him or her in monitoring comprehension processes through the selection and implementation of specific strategies to achieve some predetermined goal or purpose for reading. The chief idea involved in metacognition is that learners must actively monitor their use of thinking processes – that they must be aware of how they are processing information – and that they can then regulate them according to the purpose for reading.

The interest in metacognition among reading educators has led to an exploration of procedures to collect data on thinking processes. Data collection on mental processes has become known as *introspective data – concurrent* and *retrospective* verbal reports. Concurrent verbal reports are collected *as the subject is engaged in the reading task*. These types of reports have been criticized for interfering with the normal processes of reading (Nisbett and Wilson, 1977; Garner, 1982). Retrospective verbal reports are collected after the subject has completed the reading task. These types of reports have been criticized because subjects may forget or inaccurately recall the mental processes they employed while completing the task (Afflerbach and Johnston, 1984).

There are differences of opinion as to the validity and reliability of verbal report data in general. However, many prominent researchers agree that verbal reports, when they are elicited with care and interpreted with full understanding of the circumstances under which they were obtained, are valuable and thoroughly reliable sources of information about cognitive processes (Afflerbach and Johnston, 1984).

Verbal reports may reveal reading processes

Research that focuses on the metacognitive aspects of reading while taking a reading test comprise only a very small portion of the literature. At least three studies, however, have used verbal reports to investigate reading processes as subjects are engaged in taking reading comprehension tests. Using concurrent verbal reports, Wingenbach (1984) examined the comprehension processes employed by twenty gifted readers in grades 4 through 7 to identify the metacognitive strategies they employed as they read the *Iowa Test of Basic Skills*, a multiple-choice standardized reading test.

Wingenbach found that subjects reported using a variety of reading strategies to comprehend the text and to answer the questions. The strategies included using context clues, rereading, inferencing, personal identification with the text, and imagery. Wingenbach did not use as a comparison any other text types, making it impossible to determine whether or not the subject's mental processing was different on the test than on any other reading task.

Alvermann and Ratekin (1982) conducted a study with 98 "average" seventh-grade and eighth-grade subjects. The subjects completed a multiple-choice test and an essay test. Only retrospective reports were collected. Results of an analysis of the verbal protocols revealed that 55 subjects reported using only one reading strategy, while 30 reported using two or more. Thirteen subjects were unable to recall any specific strategy. In the report, Alvermann and Ratekin elaborate only on the statistically significant differences in strategies. They found that subjects who read to respond on an essay test "reread" more frequently than students who read the same passage knowing they will respond to multiple-choice items. In addition, subjects who read to complete an essay test reported using multiple strategies nearly twice as often as students who read for a multiple-choice test.

Other differences that were not statistically significant, may be important nevertheless. An examination of a chart representing the frequency of reported strategies shows that students read for details twice as often in the multiple-choice test as they did in the essay test. There were four reports of imaging (forming a picture of the text) in the essay test compared to one in the multiple-choice test. Subjects made a personal connection with the text an average of seven times when taking the multiple-choice test but only three during the essay test.

The use of only retrospective verbal reports severely limits the conclusions made by the researchers. When retrospection alone is used, the chances that the subjects forgot the mental processes they employed are greatly enhanced. In addition, the differences found may have been due to individual or group differences rather than task-related differences. There is little information in the report to support that the two groups were equivalent.

Powell (1988) conducted a study with nine proficient sixth-grade readers. All the subjects were observed, and they provided concurrent verbal reports as they were engaged in multiple-choice tests, cloze tests, written retellings, and a nonassessed reading task. The subjects gave retrospective verbal reports afterward. Twenty-one reading processes were identified from the verbal reports. The overall conclusions of this investigation indicated that the reading processes did differ as subjects were engaged in each of the tasks. The task which elicited behavior the most different from the other three was the cloze test. Subjects reported rereading and using context clues a great deal more on this task than on any of the others. They tied prior knowledge to the text and paraphrased the text a great deal less than in performing the other reading tasks.

The multiple-choice test and the written retellings,on the other hand, were very similar to each other and to the nonassessed reading task. The subjects reported tying prior knowledge in with the text, visualizing what was happening in the text, and paraphrasing the text almost with equal frequency across all three tasks. Therefore, within the limitations of the Powell study, it can be concluded that multiple-choice tests and written retellings had construct validity. While the scores (products) of these tests may not reveal direct information on the processes students use to complete them, the tasks do appear to involve mental processes that have long been associated with reading.

References

Afflerbach, Peter, and Johnston, Peter. "On the use of verbal reports in reading research," *Journal of Reading Behavior, 16* (4), 1984, pp. 307-322.

Alverman, Donne, and Ratekin, Ned. "Metacognitive knowledge about reading proficiency: Its relation to study strategies and task demands." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, 1982.

Aronson, Edith, and Farr, Roger. "Issues in assessment," *Journal of Reading, 32* (2), November 1988, pp. 174-177.

Farr, Roger. "A response to Hoopfer and Hunsberger," *Forum in Reading and Language Education*, October 1986, pp. 129-133.

Farr, Roger, and Roser, Nancy. *Teaching a child to read.* New York: Harcourt Brace Javanovich, 1977.

Garner, Ruth. "Verbal-report data on reading strategies," *Journal of Reading Behavior, 14* (2), 1982, pp. 159-167.

Johnston, Peter. *Reading comprehension assessment: A cognitive basis.* Newark, Delaware: International Reading Association, 1983, 102 pp. [ED 226 338]

Johnston, Peter. "Assessing the process and the process of assessment in the language arts." In James Squire (Ed.), *The dynamics of language learning: Research in the language arts.* Urbana, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1986, 420 pp. [ED 280 080]

Meichenbaum, D.; Burland, S.; Gruson, L.; and Cameron, R. Metacognitive assessment. In S. R. Yussen (Ed.), *The growth of reflection in children.* Orlando: Academic Press, 1985.

Nisbett, Richard, and Wilson, Timothy. (1977). "Telling more than we can know: Verbal reports on mental processes," *Psychological Review, 84* (3), 1977, pp. 231-259.

Powell, Janet L. "An examination of comprehension processes used by readers as they engage in different forms of assessment. "Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Indiana University, 1988. 196 pp. [ED 298 449]

Thorndike, Edward. "Reading as reasoning: A study of mistakes in paragraph reading," *Reading Research Quarterly, 6* (4), 1971 [reprint of original 1917 article], pp. 425-434.

Wingenbach, Nancy (1984). "The gifted reader: Metacognition and comprehension strategies." Paper presented at the 3rd Annual Meeting of the National Council of Teachers of English, Spring Conference, 1984. 29pp. [ED 243 093]

ERIC Clearinghouse on
Reading and Communication Skills
Indiana University
Smith Research Center
2805 East Tenth Street, Suite 150
Bloomington, IN 47408
(812) 855-5847

This publication was prepared with funding from the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education, under contract no. RI88062001. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Points of view or opinions, however, do not necessarily represent the official view or opinions of the Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

Task #1

Goal Statement

Your Name:_____

Course #:_____

Learning package:_____

The purpose of writing a goal statement is to create an expectation for yourself, to establish a purpose that you can check when you have finished reviewing the package of materials. It should be used in conjunction with your reaction statement--the commentary that you will make after working your way through the materials in the learning package.

Directions: This is a pre-reading activity. Think about the topic of this package and then look at the various materials, primarily reviewing their headlines and subheads. What does that review prompt you to want to discover through this package?

Write a goal statement of no more than one paragraph that includes the questions that you want answered or the kinds of applications that you hope the package will help you accomplish in your work. Attached please find examples of representative goal statements submitted by former students.

Mail a copy of your goal statement to your instructor. Please keep a copy for yourself because your reaction statement should be based partly on the goal statement.

My Goal Statement for this Package

Please mail a copy of this form to:

Carl B. Smith
150 Smith Research Center
Indiana University
Bloomington, IN 47408-2698

Examples of Goal Statements

It is my expectation that this learning package will direct me in new directions so that I may improve my instruction in the area of vocabulary. I would like to know when it is best to introduce new vocabulary words. I would also like to gain information about new methods one might use when introducing new vocabulary. I expect to read about some of the newest research related to vocabulary instruction. It is also expected that tested methods will be described and examined. I would hope that these articles would help me improve how I teach so that my students will benefit and become better readers.

Following the study of this package, I expect to increase my understanding of computer usage in reading development, learn how to integrate computers into reading and writing instruction for learning impaired students, and make decisions on the usefulness of computer games in the classroom.

Following completion of this package I intend to:
1)Identify the components of a formal reading program evaluation.
2)Analyze the characteristics of an effective reading program.
3)Develop evaluation strategies that will improve the monitoring of my program objectives.

Task #2

Reaction Statement

You are asked to type a four-page reaction to this learning package as a way of firming up your sense of what you find interesting, important, or beneficial in this group of materials. You should construct this reaction with your previously established goal statement in mind.

Given below are a number of prompts to indicate the kinds of questions that you might wish to answer in developing this reaction. You may use other questions than those that are here listed. We anticipate that your reaction will be approximately four typewritten, double-spaced pages. Please use the following format in heading your paper.

Reaction

Your Name:_____

Course #:_____

Learning Package:_____

Reaction Prompts

1. Were your goals realized, and how do you know? (Refer to your goal statement.)

2. What important or beneficial ideas did you find in these materials? (Please cite the articles.)

3. Are there trends or concerns in the materials that bother you? Are there those that you agree with? Discuss. (Please use the annotated bibliography and cite ideas from it.)

4. What ideas did you want to try in your daily work world? Describe how you could apply these ideas?

Application Project

If you decide to use this topic for one of your two application projects, you may want to spend more time thinking about ways that you could explore one or more of these ideas in your work.

When you have finished your statement, please mail it to:

Carl B. Smith
150 Smith Research Center
Indiana University
Bloomington, IN 47408-2698

Task #3

Application Project

As you select your two application projects, use the following guidelines:

1. **Formulate a question** that you would like to answer regarding this topic. (For example, can my slow readers use some of the self-monitoring strategies discussed in these materials?) A question often helps to clarify the kinds of information that you will collect or the kinds of evidence that you will use to convince a reader that you are pursuing an interesting question.

2. **Describe with as much detail** as is needed for a reader to understand what you did, what materials you used, what major procedures you used, what evidence you were looking for, in order to answer your question.

3. **Gather evidence** from your students or from teachers to show samples of the kinds of work or the kinds of interactions that were taking place. These samples may be your written observations, sample student papers, photographs, activity sheets, book titles, statistical data, or any other kind of evidence that demonstrates the reality of your inquiry.

4. **Write a summary** of your plan and of your conclusions. The summary should be coherent and clear so a person who was not on site can understand what you attempted and can appreciate the conclusions that you drew.

5. **Send a report** that includes a summary of your plan, sample evidence of what you found, a brief analysis of the evidence, and the conclusions that you

6. **Provide a cover page** that gives your name, address, course number, topic of learning package, and topic of your project. We will mail you a critique of your work. Send your report to:

   Carl B. Smith
   150 Smith Research Center
   Indiana University
   Bloomington, IN 47408-2698

Course Number_____ **Date**_____

Package Title_____

Statements	Strongly Agree	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. This package will help me do my job better.					
2. The pace of the package was too fast.					
3. The package's directions were confusing.					
4. It was easy to follow the directions given in the package.					
5. The package was too easy.					
6. The package was too long.					
7. The package should include more articles and documents to read.					
8. I didn't know the meaning of many words used in the package.					
9. The lecture explicated the topic of the package.					
10. The package's objectives were clear from the start.					
11. The package's teaching points were clear.					

What did you like best about the package?

What did you like least about the package?

How would you improve the package?

Please list other topics you would be interested in studying through our program.

Name (optional)_____

Position_____

Years Taught_____

Please mail a copy of this form to:

Carl B. Smith
150 Smith Research Center
Indiana University
Bloomington, IN 47408-2698

ERIC/RCS

Selected Abstracts from the ERIC Database

ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading & Communication Skills
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana
(812) 855-5847

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Sample ERIC Abstract

AN ED289160
AU Binkley,-Marilyn-R.; And-Others
TI Becoming a Nation of Readers: What Parents Can Do.
CS Heath (D.C.) and Co., Lexington, Mass,; Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PY 1988
AV What Parents Can Do, Consumer Information Center, Pueblo, CO 81009 ($.50).
NT 40 p.; For Becoming a Nation of Readers: The Report of the Commission on Reading, see ED 253 865.
PR EDRS Price - MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DE Beginning-Reading; Literacy-Education; Parent-Attitudes; Parent-Child-Relationship; Preschool-Children; Primary-Education; Reading-Aloud-to-Others; Reading-Attitudes; Recreational-Reading; Written-Language
DE *Literacy-; *Parent-Influence; *Parent-Participation; *Reading-Instruction; *Reading-Processes
ID Reading-Motivation
AB Intended for parents and based on the premise that parents are their children's first and most important teachers, this booklet is a distillation of findings from the 1984 report of the Commission on Reading, "Becoming a Nation of Readers." The introduction reiterates the Commission's conclusions (1) that a parent is a child's first tutor in unraveling the puzzle of written language; (2) that parents should read to preschool children and informally teach them about reading and writing; and (3) that parents should support school-aged children's continued growth as readers. Chapter 1 defines reading as the process of constructing meaning from written texts, a complex skill requiring the coordination of a number of interrelated sources of information. Chapter 2, on the preschool years, focuses on talking to the young child, reading aloud to the preschooler, and teaching children about written language. The third chapter, on beginning reading, counsels parents on what to look for in good beginning reading programs in schools, and how to help the child with reading at home. The fourth chapter, on developing readers and making reading an integral part of learning, offers suggestions for helping the child succeed in school and for encouraging reading for fun. The afterword calls on teachers, publishers, and school personnel, as well as parents, to participate actively in creating a literate society. The booklet concludes with a list of organizations that provide practical help or publications for parents.

Interpretation of ERIC Abstract Field Identifiers

AN ERIC accession number (Use this number when ordering microfiche and paper copies.)
AU Author(s)
TI Title
CS Corporate source
PY Actual or approximate publication date
AV Source and price (availability)
NT Pagination and additional information (such as legibility or related documents)
PR Indicates availability of document from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service
DE Descriptors-indexing terms from the *Thesaurus of ERIC Descriptors* which indicate important concepts in the document
ID Identifiers-indexing terms not included in the *Thesaurus of ERIC Descriptors*
AB Summary

AN: ED239247
AU: Allen,-JoBeth
TI: Taylor-Made Education: The Influence of the Efficiency Movement on the Testing of Reading Skills.
PY: [1979]
NT: 19 p.
PR: EDRS Price - MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DE: Educational-History; Educational-Philosophy; Minimum-Competency-Testing; Objective-Tests; Reading-Rate; Recall-Psychology; Standardized-Tests; Testing-
DE: *Efficiency-; *Reading-Comprehension; *Reading-Tests; *Test-Reliability
AB: Much of what has developed in the testing of reading harkens back to the days of the "Cult of Efficiency" movement in education that can be largely attributed to Frederick Winslow Taylor. Taylor spent most of his productive years studying time and motion in an attempt to streamline industrial production so that people could work as quickly and efficiently as possible. Education embraced most of Taylor's principles in the early 1900s, and journal articles of the period have documented the extensive influence of this "Cult of Efficiency" on the thinking of educational leaders. It is more than coincidental that standardized tests in subject areas first appeared around 1910, when Taylor and his educational followers were most vocal. The essay test was also replaced with objective tests that took little time to complete and less time to grade. Speed and factual recall, rather than critical comprehension, continue to represent the two most widely tested aspects of reading, although research has confirmed that speed is not an ample measure of reading ability. The question that must concern today's educators is whether the back to basics/competency testing movement is a return to that philosophy of efficiency. (HTH)

AN: EJ378637
AU: Aronson,-Edith; Farr,-Roger
TI: Issues in Assessment (ERIC/RCS).
PY: 1988
JN: Journal-of-Reading; v32 n2 p174-77 Nov 1988
AV: UMI
DE: Reading-Comprehension; Reading-Research; Test-Bias; Test-Construction; Test-Theory
DE: *Reading-Tests; *Testing-Problems
AB: Discusses issues in reading assessment, including the concern that tests can not measure the reading process. Concludes that tests will never be more than useful indicators; calls for more research and examination of existing and new types of reading comprehension tests. (MM)

AN: EJ279352
AU: Blanchard,-Jay-S.; And-Others
TI: Determining Instructional Reading Level: Standardized Multiple

Choice versus IRI Probed Recall Questions.
PY: 1983
JN: Journal-of-Reading; v26 n8 p684-89 May 1983
AV: Reprint: UMI
DE: Elementary-Secondary-Education; Reading-Diagnosis; Recall-Psychology
DE: *Informal-Reading-Inventories; *Multiple-Choice-Tests; *Reading-Ability; *Reading-Instruction; *Reading-Research; *Standardized-Tests
AB: Compares results of standardized reading tests with informal reading inventories to determine whether teachers should favor one score over the other as an indicator of instructional reading level. (FL)

AN: EJ342364
AU: Blanchard,-Jay; Johns,-Jerry
TI: Informal Reading Inventories--A Broader View.
PY: 1986
JN: Reading-Psychology; v7 n3 piii-vii 1986
AV: UMI
DE: Elementary-Secondary-Education; Reading-Diagnosis; Reading-Tests; Teacher-Role; Test-Theory
DE: *Evaluation-Criteria; *Informal-Reading-Inventories; *Reading-Instruction; *Reading-Research; *Test-Use
AB: Concludes that IRIs can be useful, flexible assessment and instruction tools in the hands of knowledgeable teachers. Offers suggestions for their use. (FL)

AN: EJ349072
AU: Brueggemann,-Louis-V.
TI: What Teachers Should Know about Test-Wiseness.
PY: 1987
JN: Reading-Horizons; v27 n3 p159-63 Apr 1987
AV: UMI
DE: Reading-Tests; Standardized-Tests; Test-Construction; Testing-
DE: *Reading-Instruction; *Reading-Research; *Teachers-; *Test-Format; *Test-Wiseness; *Theory-Practice-Relationship
AB: Reviews research dealing with test wiseness and concludes that teachers and others who administer tests and those who review results should consider the degree to which test wiseness characteristics might have been operative had a planned effort been undertaken to provide special instruction. (FL)

AN: EJ350543
AU: Chall,-Jeanne-S.; Curtis,-Mary-E.
TI: What Clinical Diagnosis Tells Us about Children's Reading.
PY: 1987
JN: Reading-Teacher; v40 n8 p784-88 Apr 1987
AV: UMI

NT: Thematic Issue: The State of Assessment in Reading
DE: Elementary-Education; Reading-Centers
DE: *Clinical-Diagnosis; *Reading-Diagnosis; *Reading-Instruction; *Reading-Tests; *Teacher-Role
AB: Provides insights and procedures used in clinical approaches to reading diagnosis and suggests ways classroom teachers might use them. (FL)

AN: ED247551
AU: Cronin,-Mary-C.
TI: The Centrality of Testing to the Theory of Reading Processes.
PY: [1982]
NT: 34 p.
PR: EDRS Price - MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DE: Elementary-Secondary-Education; Learning-Theories; Reading-Diagnosis; Reading-Instruction
DE: *Reading-Processes; *Reading-Tests; *Test-Construction; *Testing-; *Test-Validity
AB: Noting that in recent years testing has fallen into disrepute, this paper demonstrates how the construction, use, and validation of tests, if adequately conceived, can increase the level of knowledge about the intricate nature of the reading processes. The first section of the paper discusses the measurement process and the process of test validation, and examines reasons why tests have often failed as instruments of scientific inquiry in reading. In addition, the section describes the Assessment of Reading Processes (ARP), a construct-referenced measure that views reading as a constant exchange between reader and text. The second section of the paper presents a theory of assessment that defines (1) the limits of the reading processes, (2) how such covert mental operations may be inferred from the reading product, and (3) rules for the generation of the structure and content of assessment items. Other topics discussed in this section include the assessment situation, the reader-text interaction, and the cognitive processes involved in reading. The third section offers a model of construct-referenced test construction and discusses each of the components of such a model, while the last section discusses the construction of the ARP. (FL)

AN: EJ284871
AU: Curtis,-Mary-E.; Glaser,-Robert
TI: Reading Theory and the Assessment of Reading Achievement.
PY: 1983
JN: Journal-of-Educational-Measurement; v20 n2 p133-47 Sum 1983
AV: Reprint: UMI
DE: Achievement-Tests; Decoding-Reading; Discourse-Analysis; Reading-Research; Semantics-; Sentences-; Test-Construction; Test-Use
DE: *Reading-Achievement; *Reading-Processes; *Reading-Tests; *Testing-
AB: The implications that cognitive approaches to the study of reading can have for the assessment of reading achievement are discussed.

Research in word decoding, semantic access, sentence processing, and discourse analysis is summarized with emphasis on processing efficiency required in one area affecting performance in another area. (Author/CM)

AN: EJ171399
AU: Drahozal,-Edward-C.; Hanna,-Gerald-S.
TI: Reading Comprehension Subscores: Pretty Bottles for Ordinary Wine
PY: 1978
JN: Journal-of-Reading; 21; 5; 416-20
AV: Reprint Available (See p. vii): UMI
DE: Cognitive-Processes; Critical-Thinking; Reading-Skills
DE: *Achievement-Tests; *Reading-Comprehension; *Reading-Diagnosis; *Reading-Research; *Reading-Tests; *Test-Validity
AB: Reviews past research and cites new research which suggest that subscores on reading comprehension tests really test the same thing and thus are not useful for diagnosing ability in skill areas. (MKM)

AN: EJ363775
AU: Farr,-Roger
TI: New Trends in Reading Assessment: Better Tests, Better Uses.
PY: 1987
JN: Curriculum-Review; v27 n1 p21-23 Sep-Oct 1987
AV: UMI
DE: Criterion-Referenced-Tests; Elementary-Secondary-Education; Norm-Referenced-Tests; Reading-Achievement; Reading-Instruction; Reading-Processes; Test-Construction
DE: *Achievement-Tests; *Reading-Ability; *Reading-Tests; *Test-Interpretation
AB: This discussion of assessing students' reading abilities focuses on the need for developing better tests and better interpretation of test scores. Criterion-referenced tests versus norm-referenced tests are described, highlighting the Degrees of Reading Power and Metropolitan Achievement Tests: Reading, and the need for assessing the reading process is discussed. (LRW)

AN: EJ306561
AU: Farr,-Roger; And-Others
TI: Scholastic Aptitude Test Performance and Reading Ability.
PY: 1984
JN: Journal-of-Reading; v28 n3 p208-14 Dec 1984
AV: UMI
DE: Criterion-Referenced-Tests; Reading-Comprehension; Reading-Research; Reading-Skills; Secondary-Education; Standardized-Tests
DE: *Academic-Aptitude; *Comparative-Analysis; *Reading-Ability; *Reading-Achievement; *Test-Interpretation; *Test-Reviews
AB: Compares twelfth-grade students' performance on the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) with their performance on the Metropolitan

Achievement Test 1: Reading Survey or the Degrees of Reading Power Test, concluding that the findings challenge the notion that low SAT scores indicate a lack of basic reading skills. (HOD)

AN: ED266438
AU: Farr,-Roger; Carey,-Robert-F.
TI: Reading: What Can Be Measured? Second Edition.
CS: International Reading Association, Newark, Del.
PY: 1986
AV: International Reading Association, 800 Barksdale Rd., P.O. Box 8139, Newark, DE 19714-8139 (Book No. 805, $9.50 member, $14.25 nonmember).
NT: 228 p.; An IRA/Elva Knight Research Fund Monograph. For the first edition, see ED 033 258.
PR: EDRS Price - MF01/PC10 Plus Postage.
DE: Elementary-Secondary-Education; Reading-Programs; Reading-Rate; Reading-Research; Study-Skills; Test-Reliability; Vocabulary-; Word-Recognition
DE: *Educational-Assessment; *Reading-Comprehension; *Reading-Skills; *Reading-Tests; *Test-Use; *Test-Validity
AB: Addressed to all concerned with reading assessment, including teachers, administrators, testmakers, and policymakers, this book describes some of the major problems involved in reading assessment and provides guidelines for the improved use of reading tests. The first chapter, on reading measurement in perspective, discusses the historical context of reading assessment and the validity of reading tests, and provides recommendations for improved test use. The second chapter presents a research perspective on reading comprehension, while the third and fourth chapters discuss the assessment of word recognition skills, reading vocabulary, study skills, and reading rate. Chapter five considers the validity and reliability of various types of reading tests, chapter six deals with issues in accountability and reading measurement, and chapter seven summarizes trends and issues in reading assessment. Lists of references conclude each chapter. (EL)

AN: ED236240
AU: Froese,-V.
TI: Trends in Canadian Provincial Reading Assessments. Revised Version.
PY: 1983
NT: 13 p.; Based on a paper presented at the World Congress on Reading (9th, Dublin, Ireland, 1982).
PR: EDRS Price - MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DE: Achievement-Tests; Elementary-Secondary-Education; Foreign-Countries; Item-Banks; Literacy-; Standardized-Tests
DE: *Educational-Assessment; *Reading-Tests; *State-Programs
AB: The purpose of this paper is to examine the assessment procedures initiated and used by most Canadian provinces during the past decade to describe public school reading achievement, to identify

commonalities and differences among those procedures, and to comment on the significance of the identified trends. The stated purposes of evaluation included information for decision-making, the provision of comparative information across time or location, curriculum improvement, professional development, and the creation of test banks for teacher use. During the late sixties and early seventies, most provinces moved away from "departmental examinations" toward the establishment of "joint committees/task forces" on evaluation, designed to provide more public input into educational decision-making. The latter half of the seventies produced an observable movement towards the use of standardized achievement tests in the assessment of provincial progress. The early eighties saw the emergence of provincially constructed achievement tests similar in nature to commercially produced tests, but based specifically on the curricula in force in a particular province. Recent decisions in Alberta and British Columbia appear to reintroduce compulsory province-wide examinations, possibly signalling a repetition of the cycle begun in the late sixties. (BW)

AN: ED273935
AU: Glenberg,-Arthur-M.; And-Others
TI: Enhancing Calibration. Program Report 86-14.
CS: Wisconsin Center for Education Research, Madison.
PY: 1986
NT: 53 p.
PR: EDRS Price - MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DE: Higher-Education; Learning-Strategies; Test-Reliability
DE: *Evaluation-Criteria; *Learning-Processes; *Reading-Comprehension; *Reading-Research; *Reading-Tests; *Testing-Problems
AB: Defining calibration of comprehension as the correlation between subjective assessments of knowledge gained from reading and performance on an objective test, this paper draws from literature, as well as the findings of original experiments, to examine issues related to the subject . The paper first documents the claim that poor calibration is the rule rather than the exception, and that poor calibration is also typical in at least one other domain, problem solving. It suggests that the high levels of calibration reported in studies on the calibration of probabilities and feeling-of-knowing research may be dependent on using feedback from taking the test to assess the probability of correct performance on the test. The paper next presents two experiments demonstrating that poor calibration is not associated with a particular type of performance test, but is found with inference tests, verbatim recognition tests, and idea recognition tests. It further shows that poor calibration cannot be attributed to unreliable testing procedures. The paper then offers evidence from three experiments indicating that a likely reason for poor calibration is that subjects assess familiarity with the general domain of a text instead of assessing knowledge gained from a particular text. Next, it demonstrates that calibration of comprehension can be enhanced if subjects are given a pretest that provides self-generated feedback--but that even this ability is

limited. The paper concludes with a discussion of the implications of these findings for theories of representation of knowledge gaining from reading. Sample materials used in the experiments are appended. (Author/FL)

AN: EJ317666
AU: Guthrie,-John-T.; Lissitz,-Robert-W.
TI: A Framework for Assessment-Based Decisionmaking in Reading Education
PY: 1985
JN: Educational-Measurement:-Issues-and-Practice; v4 n2 p26-30 Sum 1985
DE: Educational-Improvement; Educational-Testing; Elementary-Secondary-Education; Program-Effectiveness; Student-Placement; Teaching-Methods; Testing-Problems
DE: *Decision-Making; *Educational-Assessment; *Measurement-Objectives; *Reading-Instruction; *Standardized-Tests
AB: This reaction paper stresses the importance of matching the qualitatively different types of educational decisions with appropriate types of tests. Reading instruction is used to illustrate that while standardized tests are helpful for student classification and program accountability, they are hazardous to instructional process decisions which need cognitive process measures. (BS)

AN: ED235461
AU: Heerman,-Charles-E.
TI: A Review of Traditional Cloze Testing Methodology.
PY: 1983
NT: 18 p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Reading Association (28th, Anaheim, CA, May 2-6, 1983).
PR: EDRS Price - MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DE: Elementary-Education; Literature-Reviews; Readability-; Reading-Tests; Test-Construction; Test-Reviews
DE: *Cloze-Procedure; *Psycholinguistics-; *Reading-Research; *Scientific-Methodology; *Test-Validity
AB: To analyze the validity of W. L. Taylor's cloze testing methodology, this paper first examines three areas contributing to Taylor's thinking: communications theory, the psychology of speech and communication, and the theory of dispositional mechanisms--or nonessential words--in speech. It then evaluates Taylor's research to determine how he established his initial methodology and what he later did to refine it. After reviewing other studies challenging the efficacy of the traditional cloze testing procedure, the paper concludes that, despite some reservations, the traditional methodology appears to provide a valid measure of readability. (MM)

AN: EJ338334
AU: Homan,-Susan-P.; And-Others
TI: Does Teacher Oral Reading of Test Items Affect the Performance of

Students of Varying Reading Ability?
PY: 1986
JN: Journal-of-Educational-Research; v79 n6 p363-65 Jul-Aug 1986
DE: Grade-5; Intermediate-Grades
DE: *Listening-Comprehension; *Reading-Comprehension; *Standardized-Tests
AB: Over 4,000 fifth graders were involved in a study to determine the effect of teacher oral reading of test items on good and poor readers. The findings suggested that having teachers read test items aloud during standardized tests yielded higher scores for both groups than having students read for themselves. (Author/MT)

AN: EJ287932
AU: Mason,-George-E.; Swanson,-Beverly-B.
TI: Why First Graders Err on Standardized Reading Tests.
PY: 1983
JN: Reading-World; v23 n1 p60-68 Oct 1983
AV: UMI
DE: Beginning-Reading; Grade-1; Primary-Education
DE: *Cognitive-Processes; *Error-Analysis-Language; *Reading-Comprehension; *Reading-Strategies; *Reading-Tests; *Standardized-Tests
AB: Concludes that, although first-grade students generate more haphazard responses on standardized reading tests than do older students, they nevertheless do apply similar reasoning strategies to vocabulary and comprehension items. (FL)

AN: EJ211416
AU: Murray,-Carolyn-K.
TI: Teaching the COM Microcatalogue.
PY: 1979
JN: RQ; v19 n1 p52-57 Fall 1979
AV: Reprint: UMI
DE: College-Libraries; College-Students; Professional-Personnel; Program-Descriptions; Speeches-
DE: *Catalogs-; *Computer-Output-Microfilm; *Library-Instruction
AB: Explains the University of Toronto Library's three-year experience in teaching users and staff via practice sessions, slides, and worksheets to use its COM (computer output microfilm) microcatalog, which is the largest in North America. (Author/JD)

AN: EJ272503
AU: Readence,-John-E.; Moore,-David-W.
TI: Why Questions? A Historical Perspective on Standardized Reading Comprehension Tests.
PY: 1983
JN: Journal-of-Reading; v26 n4 p306-13 Jan 1983
AV: Reprint: UMI
DE: Educational-History; Literature-Reviews; Test-Format

DE: *Questioning-Techniques; *Reading-Tests; *Standardized-Tests; *Test-Construction
AB: Examines the development of standardized reading comprehension tests in the critical states from the early 1900s through current testing trends. (AEA)

AN: EJ330785
AU: Rowe,-Deborah-W.
TI: Does Research Support the Use of "Purpose Questions" on Reading Comprehension Tests?
PY: 1986
JN: Journal-of-Educational-Measurement; v23 n1 p43-55 Spr 1986
AV: UMI
DE: Advance-Organizers; Cues-; Learning-Processes; Literature-Reviews; Schemata-Cognition
DE: *Questioning-Techniques; *Reading-Comprehension; *Reading-Tests
AB: The inclusion of "purpose questions" before passages in reading comprehension tests is evaluated in light of recent research related to schema theory and adjunct questions. While research supports the use of purpose questions, gaps and weaknesses in the available data exist. Suggestions for further study are provided. (Author/LMO)

AN: EJ272388
AU: Royer,-James-M.; Lynch,-Douglas-J.
TI: The Misuses and Appropriate Uses of Norm-Referenced Tests of Reading Comprehension.
PY: 1982
JN: Reading-Psychology; v3 n2 p131-42 Apr-Jun 1982
AV: Reprint: UMI
DE: Reading-Instruction; Testing-Problems
DE: *Norm-Referenced-Tests; *Reading-Comprehension; *Reading-Research; *Reading-Tests; *Test-Use; *Test-Validity
AB: Reviews four uses for norm-referenced tests of reading comprehension. Concludes that three of the uses are actually misuses and that the only appropriate use is for predicting future student performance. (FL)

AN: EJ274214
AU: Schell,-Leo-M.
TI: How Accurate are Oral Reading Tests?
PY: 1982
JN: Reading-World; v22 n2 p91-97 Dec 1982
AV: Reprint: UMI
DE: Elementary-Secondary-Education; Reading-Research
DE: *Error-Analysis-Language; *Oral-Reading; *Reading-Tests; *Test-Reliability; *Test-Validity
AB: Argues that the results of oral reading tests may be interpreted as being more precise and reliable than is warranted and that the amount of error in the results of these tests may make them more

variable than is typically assumed. Recommends ways to improve the interpretation of oral reading test scores. (FL)

AN: EJ367430
AU: Valencia,-Sheila-W.; Pearson,-P.-David
TI: Principles for Classroom Comprehension Assessment.
PY: 1988
JN: Remedial-and-Special-Education-(RASE); v9 n1 p26-35 Jan-Feb 1988
AV: UMI
DE: Classroom-Techniques; Educational-Diagnosis; Elementary-Secondary-Education; Evaluation-Methods; Reading-Processes; Teacher-Student-Relationship
DE: *Reading-Comprehension; *Reading-Difficulties; *Reading-Tests; *Student-Evaluation
AB: Principles that should guide reading comprehension assessment include acknowledging the complexity of reading, focusing on orchestrating rather than isolating skills, regarding reading as a dynamic process, developing techniques that encourage student-teacher interactions, and using a variety of reading comprehension measures. The principles are applied to several classroom assessment situations. (Author/JDD)

AN: ED281167
AU: Valencia,-Sheila; Pearson,-P.-David
TI: New Models for Reading Assessment. Reading Education No. 71.
CS: Bolt, Beranek and Newman, Inc., Cambridge, Mass.; Illinois Univ., Urbana. Center for the Study of Reading.
PY: 1986
NT: 14 p.
PR: EDRS Price - MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DE: Educational-Theories; Elementary-Education; Evaluation-Criteria; Reading-Processes; Reading-Research; Reading-Skills; Reading-Strategies; Student-Evaluation; Test-Validity; Theory-Practice-Relationship
DE: *Informal-Reading-Inventories; *Models-; *Reading-Achievement; *Reading-Diagnosis; *Reading-Tests; *Testing-Problems
AB: During the last 20 years, the relationship between reading instruction and assessment has been framed by the logic of mastery learning. The ultimate goal of mastery learning is assuring a given achievement outcome across students by varying input characteristics such as the amount and kind of instruction and practice, or the attention paid to prerequisite skills and aptitude characteristics of individual learners. Although the focus on testing has increased with the call for educational reform, currently available tests do not reflect advances in reading theory, practice, or research. The best possible assessment of reading seems to occur when teachers observe and interact with students as they read, evaluating the way in which the students orchestrate resources to construct meaning. An effective framework for complete reading assessment takes into consideration the relationship between objectives, decision-making units, and methods of

assessment, and contains three critical features: (1) the attributes should reflect a theoretically sound model of the reading process, (2) the attributes should be highly interdependent and cannot be measured discretely, and (3) whatever is worthy of assessment ought to be assessable in different contexts for different purposes using a variety of strategies. In refocusing statewide assessment of reading, novel concepts that encourage strategic reading and that redefine the assessment-instruction link are being evaluated, such as summary writing, metacognitive judgments, question selection, multiple acceptable responses, and topic familiarity. The goal for reading instructors should be to develop valid, reliable, and usable strategies for assessment of reading comprehension. (Twenty-one references, a list of contrasts between new views of reading and current practices in reading assessment, and a framework of the relationship between objectives, decision-making units, and assessment methods are included.) (NKA)

AN: EJ350533
AU: Valencia,-Sheila; Pearson,-P.-David
TI: Reading Assessment: Time for a Change.
PY: 1987
JN: Reading-Teacher; v40 n8 p726-32 Apr 1987
AV: UMI
NT: Thematic Issue: The State of Assessment in Reading
DE: Elementary-Education; Reading-Comprehension; Test-Reliability; Test-Validity
DE: *Reading-Achievement; *Reading-Instruction; *Reading-Processes; *Reading-Tests; *Testing-Problems; *Theory-Practice-Relationship
AB: Argues that the tests used to measure reading achievement do not reflect recent advances in the understanding of the reading process, and that effective instruction best can be fostered by resolving the discrepancy between what is known and what is measured. (FL)

AN: EJ282583
AU: Valmont,-William-J.
TI: Cloze and Maze Instructional Techniques: Differences and Definitions.
PY: 1983
JN: Reading-Psychology; v4 n2 p163-67 Apr-Jun 1983
AV: Reprint: UMI
DE: Comparative-Analysis; Elementary-Secondary-Education; Reading-Comprehension; Reading-Tests
DE: *Cloze-Procedure; *Reading-Diagnosis; *Reading-Instruction
AB: Promulgates definitions of instructional maze and cloze procedures, clarifies the basic facets of the techniques, and discusses both the instructional and diagnostic functions of each. (FL)

AN: EJ289197

AU: Wade,-Barrie; Dewhirst,-Wendy
TI: Reading Comprehension Revisited.
PY: 1983
JN: Educational-Research; v25 n3 p171-76 Nov 1983
DE: Cloze-Procedure; Teaching-Methods
DE: *Reading-Comprehension; *Reading-Tests
AB: Examines the concept of reading comprehension through a review of ways particular authorities have conceptualized it in models of the process and form of testing and assessing. Considers insights from this examination in the light of the business of teaching reading. (NRJ)

AN: EJ289082
AU: Wick,-John-W.
TI: Reducing Proportion of Chance Scores in Inner-City Standardized Testing Results: Impact on Average Scores.
PY: 1983
JN: American-Educational-Research-Journal; v20 n3 p461-63 Fall 1983
AV: UMI
DE: Educational-Testing; Elementary-Secondary-Education; Urban-Education
DE: *Reading-Achievement; *Scores-; *Standardized-Tests
AB: Prior to 1975, students in Chicago Public Schools were assigned grade level tests, a practice that in 1974 resulted in 42 percent of the students scoring at the equivalent of a "chance" level. In 1975, the schools switched to functioning level testing. The change caused lower average test scores, but the percentage of chance scores dropped to eight percent. (LC)

AN: EJ291208
AU: Wixson,-Karen-K.; And-Others
TI: An Interview for Assessing Students' Perceptions of Classroom Reading Tasks.
PY: 1984
JN: Reading-Teacher; v37 n4 p346-52 Jan 1984
AV: UMI
DE: Elementary-Education; Evaluation-Methods; Reading-Skills; Reading-Tests; Teacher-Role
DE: *Individual-Testing; *Interviews-; *Reading-Comprehension; *Reading-Diagnosis; *Reading-Strategies
AB: Describes the Reading Comprehension Interview, an individual interview procedure for gathering information about students' perceptions of classroom reading activities. Explains how it can help teachers gain insights into students' actual reading strategies. Contains a copy of the interview. (FL)

GETTING COPIES OF THE ITEMS DESCRIBED IN THE ERIC DATABASE:

The items described in the ERIC database have either an "ED" or an "EJ" number in the first field. **About 98% of the ED items can be found in the ERIC Microfiche Collection.** The ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS) in Alexandria, Virginia can produce either microfiche or paper copies of these documents for you. Check the accompanying list of **ERIC Price Codes** for their current prices.

Alternatively, you may prefer to consult the ERIC Microfiche Collection yourself before choosing documents to copy. Over 600 libraries in the United States subscribe to this collection. To find out which libraries near you have it, you are welcome to call the ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication Skills at (812) 855-5847. Most such libraries have equipment on site for inexpensive production of paper copies from the fiche.

For those few ED-numbered items not found in the Microfiche Collection, check the availability (AV) field of the citation to get information about the author, publisher, or other distributor.

Items with an EJ number in the first field of the citation are journal articles. Due to copyright restrictions, ERIC cannot provide copies of these articles. Most large college or university libraries subscribe to the journals in which these articles were published, and the general public can read or copy the articles from their collections. Should you want copies of articles which appeared in journals not owned by your nearest university library, arrangements usually can be made via interlibrary loan; there frequently is a nominal charge for this, which is set by the lending library. If you are a faculty member, staff member, or student at the university, just ask at your library's reference desk.

For all other categories of users, most universities cannot provide interlibrary services. However, public libraries---which are there to serve all area residents---typically are hooked into statewide lending networks designed to ensure that all state residents have access to materials of interest. Ask your local public librarian about interlibrary loan policies, charges, etc.

There are also two professional reprint services which have obtained permission from some journals to sell article copies. These are University Microfilms International (Article Clearinghouse, 300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106---(800) 732-0616), and the Institute for Scientific Information (Original Article Tear Sheet Service, 3501 Market Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104---(800) 523-1850). At the time of this publication, UMI charged $10.75 per article regardless of length, and ISI charged $9.50 for the first ten pages, plus $2.00 for each additional ten pages or fraction thereof. However, please check with them for current prices before ordering.

ERIC Price Codes

PAPER COPY /HARD COPY

PRICE CODE	PAGINATION	PRICE
PC 01	1 - 25	$ 2.03
PC 02	26 - 50	4.06
PC 03	51 - 75	6.09
PC 04	76 - 100	8.12
PC 05	101 - 125	10.15
PC 06	126 - 150	12.18
PC 07	151 - 175	14.21
PC 08	176 - 200	16.24
PC 09	201 - 225	18.27
PC 10	226 - 250	20.30
PC 11	251 - 275	22.33
PC 12	276 - 300	24.36
PC 13	301 - 325	26.39
PC 14	326 - 350	28.42
PC 15	351 - 375	30.45
PC 16	376 - 400	32.48
PC 17	401 - 425	34.51
PC 18	426 - 450	36.54
PC 19	451 - 475	38.57
PC 20	476 - 500	40.60
PC 21	501 - 525	42.63
PC 22	526 - 550	44.66
PC 23	551 - 575	46.69
PC 24	576 - 600	48.72
PC 25	601 - 625	50.75
PC 26	626 - 650	52.78
PC 27	651 - 675	54.81
PC 28	676 - 700	56.84
PC 29	701 - 725	58.87
PC 30	726 - 750	60.90
PC 31	751 - 775	62.93
PC 32	776 - 800	64.96
PC 33	801 - 825	66.99
PC 34	826 - 850	69.02
PC 35	851 - 875	71.05
PC 36	876 - 900	73.08
PC 37	901 - 925	75.11
PC 38	926 - 950	77.14
PC 39	951 - 975	79.17
PC 40	976 - 1,000	81.20

ADD 2.03 FOR EACH ADDITIONAL 25 PAGES,
OR FRACTION THEREOF

MICROFICHE

PRICE CODE	PAGINATION	NO. OF FICHE	PRICE
MF 01	1 - 480	1-5	$ .86
MF 02	481 - 576	6	1.03
MF 03	577 - 672	7	1.20
MF 04	673 - 768	8	1.37
MF 05	769 - 864	9	1.54
MF 06	865 - 960	10	1.71
MF 07	961 - 1,056	11	1.88
MF 08	1,057 - 1,152	12	2.05
MF 09	1,153 - 1,248	13	2.22
MF 10	1,249 - 1,344	14	2.39
MF 11	1,345 - 1,440	15	2.56
MF 12	1,441 - 1,536	16	2.73
MF 13	1,537 - 1,632	17	2.90
MF 14	1,633 - 1,728	18	3.07
MF 15	1,729 - 1,824	19	3.24

ADD $0.17 FOR EACH ADDITIONAL MICROFICHE
(1-96 PAGES)

HOW TO ORDER ERIC DOCUMENTS

EDRS **ERIC®** **DOCUMENT REPRODUCTION SERVICE**

7420 FULLERTON ROAD, SUITE 110
SPRINGFIELD, VA 22153-2852

OPERATED BY

CINCINNATI BELL INFORMATION SYSTEMS (CBIS) FEDERAL
800-443-3742 703-440-1400

IMPORTANT INSTRUCTIONS TO COMPLETE THIS ORDER FORM

- Order by 6 digit ED number
- Enter unit price
- Specify either Microfiche (MF) or Paper Copy (PC)
- Include shipping charges

ED NUMBER	NO. OF PAGES	NO. OF COPIES MF	NO. OF COPIES PC	UNIT PRICE	TOTAL UNIT COST
TOTAL NO. OF PAGES				SUBTOTAL	
UNIT PRICE SCHEDULE				RESIDENTS OF VA, MD AND DC - ADD APPLICABLE SALES TAX	
				SHIPPING CHARGES	
				TOTAL COST	

MICROFICHE (MF)

NUMBER FICHE EACH ED #	PRICE CODE	Price
1 to 5 (up to 480 pages)	MF01	$1.15
Each additional microfiche (additional 96 pages)		$ .25

PAPER COPY (PC)

NUMBER PAGES EACH ED #	PRICE CODE	Price
1 to 25	PC01	$3.12
Each additional 25 pages		$3.12

CHARTS FOR DETERMINING SHIPPING CHARGES

U.S. POSTAL SERVICE 1st CLASS POSTAGE FOR					MICROFICHE ONLY	
1-7 Microfiche ONLY $0.29	8-19 Microfiche ONLY $0.52	20-30 Microfiche ONLY $0.75	31-42 Microfiche ONLY $0.98	43-54 Microfiche ONLY $1.21	55-67 Microfiche ONLY $1.44	68-80 Microfiche ONLY $1.67

UNITED PARCEL SERVICE CHARGES FOR CONTINENTAL U.S. SHIPMENTS ONLY*
***UPS will not deliver to a P.O. Box Number. A Street Address must be provided.**

1 lb. 81-160 MF or 1-75 PC PAGES Not to Exceed $2.79	2 lbs. 161-330 MF or 76-150 PC PAGES Not to Exceed $3.30	3 lbs. 331-500 MF or 151-225 PC PAGES Not to Exceed $3.74	4 lbs. 501-670 MF or 226-300 PC PAGES Not to Exceed $4.09	5 lbs. 671-840 MF or 301-375 PC PAGES Not to Exceed $4.31	6 lbs. 841-1010 MF or 376-450 PC PAGES Not to Exceed $4.53	7 lbs. 1011-1180 MF or 451-525 PC PAGES Not to Exceed $4.77	8 to 10 lbs. 1181-1690 MF 526-750 PC PAGES Not to Exceed $5.17-$5.94

NOTE—Orders for 81 or more microfiche and all orders for paper copies (PC) will be shipped via United Parcel Service unless otherwise instructed.

SEE REVERSE FOR EXPEDITED DOCUMENT DELIVERY SERVICE

PAYMENTS: You may pay by

1. Enclosing CHECK or MONEY ORDER with your order. Foreign customer checks must be drawn on a U.S. bank.
2. Charge to a MasterCard or VISA account. Enter account number, card expiration date and signature. (EDRS also accepts telephone orders when charged to a MasterCard or VISA account.)
3. PURCHASE ORDERS: U.S. customers may enclose an authorized original purchase order. No purchase orders are accepted from foreign customers.
4. Charge to a DEPOSIT ACCOUNT. Enter deposit account number and sign order form.

PLEASE INDICATE METHOD OF PAYMENT AND ENTER REQUIRED INFORMATION.

VISA

WE HONOR BOTH

MasterCard

☐ Check or Money Order ☐ Purchase Order (ATTACH ORIGINAL PURCHASE ORDER)

☐ MasterCard ☐ VISA

Account Number _____ Expiration Date _____

Signature _____

☐ Deposit Account Number _____

Signature _____

ENTER "SHIP TO" ADDRESS _____

_____

_____

CALL TOLL FREE 1-800-443-ERIC (3742) 24 HOURS A DAY - 7 DAYS A WEEK
ALLOW 5 WORKING DAYS FOR EDRS TO PROCESS AND SHIP YOUR ORDER

EXPEDITED DOCUMENT DELIVERY

Expedited delivery of ERIC documents is available.

- Call in your order 24 hours a day toll free 1-800-443-ERIC (3742).
- Fax your order 24 hours a day 703-440-1408.

Your order will be shipped to you, by the method you select, on the fifth (5th) working day after receipt.

To insure expedited receipt, request shipment by either:

- USPS Express Mail
- Federal Express
- UPS Next Day Air
- FAX transmission of your document

Shipping and FAX transmission charges will be added to the cost of the document(s) by EDRS.

These requesting and delivery methods are in addition to the 3-day delivery services available in response to orders received through the use of on-line data base services.

STANDING ORDERS SUBSCRIPTION ACCOUNTS

Subscription orders for documents in the monthly issue of **Resources in Education (RIE)** are available on microfiche from EDRS. The microfiche are furnished on a diazo film base and without envelopes at $0.111 per microfiche. If you prefer a silver halide film base, the cost is $0.225 per microfiche and each microfiche is inserted into a protective envelope. SHIPPING CHARGES ARE EXTRA. A Standing Order Account may be opened by depositing $1,500.00 or submitting an executed purchase order. The cost of each issue and shipping will be charged against the account. A monthly statement of the account will be furnished.

BACK COLLECTIONS

Back collections of documents in all issues of **Resources in Education (RIE)** since 1966 are available on microfiche at a unit price of $0.131 per microfiche. The collections from 1966 through 1985 are furnished on a vesicular film base and without envelopes. Since 1986, collections are furnished on a diazo film base without envelopes. SHIPPING CHARGES ARE EXTRA. For pricing information, write or call toll free 1-800-443-ERIC (3742).

GENERAL INFORMATION

1. PRICE LIST
The prices set forth herein may be changed without notice; however, any price change is subject to the approval of the Contracting Officer/USED/Office of Educational Research and Improvement/Contracts and Grants Management Division.

2. PAYMENT
The prices set forth herein do not include any sales, use, excise, or similar taxes that may apply to the sale of microfiche or paper copy to the Customer. The cost of such taxes, if any, shall be borne by the Customer.

Payment shall be made net thirty (30) days from date of invoice. Payment shall be without expense to CBIS Federal.

3. REPRODUCTION
Express permission to reproduce a copyrighted document provided hereunder must be obtained from the copyright holder noted on the title page of such copyrighted document.

4. CONTINGENCIES
CBIS Federal shall not be liable to Customer or any other person for any failure or delay in the performance of any obligation if such failure or delay (a) is due to events beyond the control of CBIS Federal including, but not limited to, fire, storm, flood, earthquake, explosion, accident, acts of the public enemy, strikes, lockouts, labor disputes, labor shortages, work stoppages, transportation embargoes or delays, failure or shortage of materials, supplies or machinery, acts of God, or acts or regulations or priorities of the federal, state, or local governments; (b) is due to failures of performances of subcontractors beyond CBIS Federal's control and without negligence on the part of CBIS Federal; or (c) is due to erroneous or incomplete information furnished by Customer.

5. LIABILITY
CBIS Federal's liability, if any, arising hereunder shall not exceed restitution of charges.

In no event shall CBIS Federal be liable for special, consequential, or liquidated damages arising from the provision of services hereunder.

6. WARRANTY
CBIS FEDERAL MAKES NO WARRANTY, EXPRESS OR IMPLIED, AS TO ANY MATTER WHATSOEVER, INCLUDING ANY WARRANTY OF MERCHANTABILITY OR FITNESS FOR ANY PARTICULAR PURPOSE.

7. QUALITY
CBIS Federal will replace products returned because of reproduction defects or incompleteness. The quality of the input document is not the responsibility of CBIS Federal. Best available copy will be supplied.

8. CHANGES
No waiver, alteration, or modification of any of the provisions hereof shall be binding unless in writing and signed by an officer of CBIS Federal.

9. DEFAULT AND WAIVER
a. If customer fails with respect to this or any other agreement with CBIS Federal to pay any invoice when due or to accept any shipment as ordered, CBIS Federal may, without prejudice to other remedies, defer any further shipments until the default is corrected, or may cancel the order.

b. No course of conduct nor any delay of CBIS Federal in exercising any right hereunder shall waive any rights of CBIS Federal or modify this Agreement.

10. GOVERNING LAW
This Agreement shall be construed to be between merchants. Any questions concerning its validity, construction, or performance shall be governed by the laws of the State of Virginia.

11. DEPOSIT ACCOUNTS
Customers who have a continuing need for ERIC documents may open a Deposit Account by depositing a minimum of $300.00. Once a Deposit Account is opened, ERIC documents will be sent upon request, and the account charged for the actual cost and postage. A monthly statement of the account will be furnished.

12. PAPER COPY (PC)
A paper copy (PC) is a xerographic reproduction, on paper, of the original document. Each paper copy has a Vellum Bristol cover to identify and protect the document.

13. FOREIGN POSTAGE
Postage for all countries other than the United States is based on the International Postage Rates in effect at the time the order is shipped. To determine postage, allow 160 microfiche or 75 (PC) pages per pound. Customers must specify the exact classification of mail desired, and include the postage for that classification with their order. Payment must be in United States funds.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE